

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW FORM

All academic programs and units at UAA are required by Board of Regents Policy P10.06.010 to engage in program review on a seven-year cycle. University Regulation R10.06.010 sets out the minimum requirements for program review, including centrality of program mission, quality, demand, program productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency. Exceptional reviews may be conducted, per University Policy and Regulation, and with the provost's approval. The UAA process integrates information about student learning outcomes assessment and the improvement of student learning, as well as progress on student success measures and the closing of equity gaps, aligning program efforts and resources with institutional priorities. Final decisions include commendations and recommendations, which guide future program efforts. The results of cyclical Academic Program Review are reported to the UA Board of Regents annually and are published on the UAA [Academic Program Review website](#).

This form is composed of four parts: the Program Section, the Dean Section, the Program Optional Response Section, and the Provost Section. Guidance for submission is provided in each section.

Using the Form: The form is pre-loaded with information specific to each program and sent by the dean to the program. The program should download and save their form to begin using it. The form is locked, so instructions are viewable and the only sections of the document that can be edited are the form fields. To ensure the fillable fields function correctly, the form must be completed in Microsoft Word. It will not function properly in Google Docs. Programs that wish to record collaborative discussion of the report might consider creating a separate document to take notes, prior to entering final responses in the official fillable form.

The form uses narrative boxes, text only, and drop-down boxes. Narrative boxes have a character limit, which includes spaces. To undo an answer, press "Control-Z" or "Command-Z."

Responses are to be narrative text only, and must be ADA and FERPA compliant, and must not include the names of any current or former employees. Do not embed any tables or links, including to webpages or other documents. To be FERPA compliant, do not include the names of any current or former students. Rather, use statements such as, "In AY22 four program graduates were accepted to graduate programs in the field." Programs with specialized accreditation or other external recognitions must comply with restrictions regarding what may be published, as per the accreditor or external organization. Do not include appendices. Appendices to this form will not be accepted.

Data: Each program is provided a datasheet, along with this pre-loaded form. For questions about the data, please contact Institutional Research (uaa.oir@alaska.edu).

Assistance: For technical assistance with this form, email Academic Affairs (uaa.oaa@alaska.edu).

Program(s) in the review: BS Applied Technologies Leadership

Specialized Accrediting Agency (if applicable): N/A.

Campuses where the program is delivered: Anchorage KOD KPC MSC PWSC

Year of last review: AY20

Final decision from last review: Continued Review

PROGRAM SECTION (Due on March 1)

The program review committee chair and committee members are assigned by the dean. All program faculty should be included in the review process, including faculty on the community campuses. After completing the Program Section below, the program review committee chair will enter their name and date, and email this form to the dean, copying all committee members. If the program is fully delivered on a community campus, copy the appropriate community campus director(s). The program review committee chair's name and date lines are at the end of the Program Section.

Program Review Committee:

Kelly Smith, Associate Professor, Automotive Technology, Chair
Tara Palmer, Professor, English as an Additional Language

1. Demonstrate that the program has responded to previous recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Continue self-evaluation and make curricular revisions as recommended by the ongoing faculty committee.

How do you know the recommendation has been successfully achieved? (2000 characters or less)

Despite the lack of an "ongoing faculty committee," the BSATL program has begun responding to this recommendation. The establishment of TECH 421 as a permanent course is part of this effort. It had been offered as a "special topics" course for many years prior to it being made a permanent course. In general, prior reviews have lamented the lack of credits generated in and available to students in the TECH prefix. Adding this course helps address this lack. However, more permanent courses in the TECH prefix and catalog copy revision will be necessary to fully address this gap. In addition, there are more courses within CTC that are not specifically listed as options for BSATL students (such as COMM 412 or a grant-writing course in WRTG or OSH 460). So, despite progress on this recommendation (made in both prior program reviews), it has not been successfully achieved because there have not been dedicated faculty to this program.

Actions taken to date (2000 characters or less)

From committee records and the CIM system, the current review committee can see that the catalog copy for the BSATL was updated in Fall 2020 and the program assessment plan was updated in Spring 2021. However, the program assessment plan does not match the catalog update and is being revised this year to better align with the current program. In addition, TECH 421 was approved through the Faculty Senate in Fall 2022. The current program review committee is not certain who completed the catalog copy update, the program assessment plan update, nor the program assessment reports between AY19 and AY22, if any were completed. Regular program outcomes assessment and revision efforts have been performed by a variety of faculty, staff, and administrators during the review period.

Evidence of success to date (2000 characters or less)

There has been no significant increase in student credit hours (SCH) generated by the program since these changes have been implemented, although the timeframe has not been sufficient to see a trend. In addition, during the period under review, the entire university suffered significant decreases in SCH production and in the number of undergraduate degree-seeking students. On the contrary, the number of majors in the BSATL has remained fairly consistent through the review period, although SCH has decreased. This may indicate that students are not taking as many courses as they have in the past or that they are being advised into other courses besides TECH courses to complete their degrees, or both. If the first is the case, then there will likely be a decrease in the number of graduates per year soon. If the latter is the case, then a change in advising approaches regarding TECH classes would increase the SCH relatively quickly. If both are the case, then it is likely that increased recruitment to the degree and a change in advising strategies is critical for maintaining healthy enrollments and graduation rates.

Recommendation 2: Continue to seek teaching faculty and “champions” from across CTC departments.

How do you know the recommendation has been successfully achieved? (2000 characters or less)

For AY23, the program currently has partial workload assignments from two full-time faculty in CTC and two adjuncts. The AY19 program review findings from the then-dean indicated that the college would, “invest in the program by identifying a core group of faculty to serve as the “department” for it, including fulfilling all of the faculty roles of curricular updates and revisions, teaching, assessment, and student mentoring...This group will then be able to support and extend the work of any new tenure track faculty member hire that takes place.” In fact, no such group was ever established and the program has continued to be a partial assignment for variously an associate dean, three different CTC faculty members, and about three different adjuncts over this time period. Advising duties for the program moved from the faculty member to a staff member and then to a different staff member. The reorganization of staff advisors at UAA has resulted in advising for this program moving outside CTC.

It is unclear what role or contributions were envisioned for the so-called “champions” in this recommendation, so it is therefore unclear what success would entail. Several faculty, staff, and administrators express support for the program, but no one has been designated or proclaimed themselves a “champion.” On the contrary, teaching faculty have been identified and undertaken the programmatic duties of faculty in a degree program.

During the review period, this recommendation has not been achieved successfully, though having dedicated faculty assigned to this program would help achieve all prior recommendations.

Actions taken to date (2000 characters or less)

In AY23, two CTC faculty have been assigned partial workload to this program. They are undertaking curriculum and assessment improvements. They have both expressed a willingness and desire to continue teaching and working in this program.

Evidence of success to date (2000 characters or less)

While there certainly are “champions” across CTC, and perhaps UAA, for this program, all programs are significantly short-staffed and unable to contribute much more than general enthusiasm or moral support for this program. Champions may not have been the most effective recommendation to make for this program.

The addition of teaching faculty to the BS ATL has allowed for progress to be made on programmatic goals, obligations, and this review. This has been a recommendation in the last two program reviews (AY19 & AY20). Since those reviews, the program has had two deans, three associate deans, and three different faculty involved in it. Having a stable department, administrators, and support staff are all critical for maintaining this program and necessary to improve it.

Recommendation 3: Work with admissions, marketing, and advising staff from across the university to recruit additional students.

How do you know the recommendation has been successfully achieved? (2000 characters or less)

This outcome has not been successfully achieved. While the program has been able to maintain a steady number of majors, the SCH production of the program has declined. There has been no consistent faculty members or group to work on this recommendation.

Actions taken to date (2000 characters or less)

The current members of the BS ATL program are not certain what actions have been taken on this recommendation and we have little evidence to indicate that it has been undertaken. The UAA website has no landing page for “degree completion” programs, such as the BS ATL. Many other institutions have a page for promoting these programs and informing potential students of their requirements and contact information. There are no printed marketing materials. The review committee is not aware of any work done with admissions staff to help recruit students. There has been significant turnover in the advising staff across UAA and combined with the current reorganization process, it is unclear that any prior actions taken to increase advisor awareness of this program have any current impact.

Evidence of success to date (2000 characters or less)

The relatively stable number of majors in this program during the review period may indicate that some actions were taken on this since AY20 when this recommendation was made. This remains an area for improvement for the program and UAA as a whole.

- 2. Demonstrate the centrality of the program to the mission, needs, and purposes of the university and the college/community campus. Include how the program is integrating (or planning to integrate) intentionally designed opportunities for students to develop the four core competencies**

(Effective Communication; Creative and Critical Thinking; Intercultural Fluency; and Personal, Professional, & Community Responsibility). (2500 characters or less)

Over 100,000 adults in Alaska have some college credit and no degree. This program has always been central to the mission of UAA in creating a career pathway for students from myriad educational and technical backgrounds. The program's current faculty are well-poised to integrate all four core competencies more effectively into the program's core curriculum and to ensure that students take appropriate coursework outside of the department. In particular, effective communication is discussed in more detail below.

As noted by former Chancellor Sandeen, "The BS-ATL is unique among programs in the university credits system, however it faces potential new competition from the UAF BAM program mentioned above. The program is distinct from the UAF program in that it is not a business degree and thus does not have the business core requirements, such as Precalculus, Statistics, or Accounting and Finance, that can present an academic barrier for some students." (AY20 EPR)

3. Demonstrate program quality and improvement through assessment and other indicators.

a. Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Improvement Process and Actions

i. BS Applied Technologies Leadership

- *1) Integrate appropriate strategic communication tools and techniques in a wide variety of business contexts; 2) Apply appropriate management tools and techniques to manage various types of projects; 3) Apply accepted leadership and management practices to promote ethical behavior and sustainable quality performance management in organizations; 4) Develop policies and procedures to ensure a safe, health, and environmentally sound workplace; 5) Develop strategies to support an organization's vision, mission and capabilities while motivating and leading internal and external constituencies.*

Describe your key findings for these outcomes. (3000 characters or less)

The BSATL has only 9 required credits in TECH. This is too narrow a curriculum in which to both achieve these program outcomes and to ensure the proper documentation of student learning. The CTC dean noted in her AY19 findings that too many courses outside the TECH program led to a lack of coherence and impaired the program's ability to function as a cohort for its students. The recommendation to concentrate more of the program within TECH courses was only partially accomplished since that finding was made. There were several major requirements in other programs that were removed, but only 9 required credits remained in TECH. No additional TECH courses were added to the core.

Final papers from the TECH 453 capstone course for AY20 were submitted to the UAA GER Assessment Committee for institutional assessment of the Written Communication and Information Literacy GER Outcomes. While the report seeks to assess these outcomes broadly, one of the faculty who works in TECH has access to the evaluation of those papers. It should not be surprising that a program with extremely limited core requirements has extremely limited ability to influence student learning outcomes, and the assessment scores of the papers indicate

that the program curriculum needs to both be expanded and to include an appropriate scaffold for technical writing skills.

Describe actions taken to improve student learning for these outcomes. (3000 characters or less)

The current review committee has no access to any program assessment data or reporting for the years under review here. The current academic assessment plan on file does not match the current program's structure, so it is being revised now.

Describe evidence that these actions are working. (3000 characters or less)

We cannot produce evidence because we do not know what actions were taken based on any program assessment work completed during the years under review.

- b. Demonstrate program quality and improvement through other means, for example, maintaining specialized accreditation, using guidance from advisory boards/councils, responding to community partners and local needs, maintaining currency of the curriculum, implementing innovative program design, intentionally integrating high-impact teaching and learning practices into the program, and meeting indications of quality in distance education, such as the C-RAC Standards. (3000 characters or less)**

The program currently implements three high impact practices: internships, capstone courses, and service-learning. TECH 453 is a GER integrated capstone and the programmatic capstone course. It allows for a focus on a real, community need with a community partner, and integrates leadership and project management skills in a project-based learning activity followed by student reflection, assessment, and evaluation of the project and course, as well as their whole undergraduate experience. This is a required course for the BSATL. The internship experiences are accomplished through TECH 412 Field-based Studies. This is not a required course, but does allow for industry-specific focus for students. They must complete a learning contract, identify their deliverables, and demonstrate their learning outcomes through this course. They meet regularly with the instructor to assess their progress and adapt to challenges as they progress.

4. Demonstrate student success and the closing of equity gaps.

- a. Analyze and respond to the disaggregated data in the data sheet for your program. Provide clarifications or explanations for any positive or negative trends indicated by the data, and discuss what you are doing to close any equity gaps. The Student Success program review metrics are Junior Graduation Rate, Associate Graduation Rate, Semesters to Degree – Graduate Programs, and Course Pass Rates by Course Level. (3000 characters or less)**

The BS ATL program is designed to provide individuals an opportunity to apply credits from certificate or associate level programs of study to complete a baccalaureate degree. This design means that they will likely have completed their lower division courses prior to entering the program. This review will not address the lower division data as it does not apply to this program. Second, the junior graduation rate is only given for two years and there is no

benchmark or comparison data given. From the two years of data provided, it appears that the Junior Graduation Rate dropped by half. These years involved a hand-off of program advising between two professional staff advisors and does not appear to have gone seamlessly. The student credit hour production between those two years also suffered, as did pass rates in the upper division TECH courses. Advising is a critical part of recruitment, retention, and success even more so than in other programs.

The data sheet did not provide any information on Semesters to Degree.

- b. Provide evidence of the overall success of students in the program. For example, you might talk about the percent of students in post-graduation employment in the field or a related field, the percent of students who go on to graduate school or other post-graduation training, and/or the percent of students who pass licensure examinations. You might also give examples of students who have been selected for major scholarships or other competitive opportunities. [Please do not use personally identifiable information.] (3000 characters or less)**

Again, the current review committee has not been involved in the program throughout the entire review period. Neither of us is in touch with any of the graduates of this program for the years under review. However, a term assistant professor of diesel power technology is a graduate of the BS ATL during this review period. At least three faculty members in CTC are graduates of the program, which demonstrates that the program helps students with a technical background advance to leadership positions in their fields.

5. Demonstrate demand for the program.

- a. Analyze and respond to the data in the data sheet for your program. Provide clarifications or explanations for any positive or negative trends indicated by the data, and discuss what you are doing to improve. The Demand program review metrics are Ratio of Out-of-Discipline Credit Hours to Total Credit Hours, Number of Program Graduates Who Continue Education, Number of Program Graduates Who Return to UAA to Pursue an Additional Program, and Gap between Job Openings and Degree Completions. (Note: Gap between Job Openings and Degree Completions not required for AY23 Program Reviews.) (3000 characters or less)**

The ratio of out-of-program credits has effectively been 0% for the last five years. This has not appeared to have been a major focus of the program; however, with the addition of TECH A421 as a permanent class and the fact that in AY23, 80% of the enrollment was from students outside of the program, this may be an avenue for increased productivity.

Overall, the program has maintained its number of majors during a time period in which undergraduate enrollment dropped across the university by 25%. However, the average number of majors during this time (47) is below the average the program has maintained for twenty years (62). It appears that they have been declining since the full-time faculty member reduced to part-time and then retired.

The number of graduates who continue their education is modest. Anecdotally, students often report having specific career plans that relate to their degree program, while fewer indicate

graduate work is a goal. However, there may be a need for an appropriate graduate program for the students from this program and others.

6. Demonstrate program productivity and efficiency.

Analyze and respond to the data in the data sheet for your program. Provide clarifications or explanations for any positive or negative trends indicated by the data, and discuss what you are doing to improve. The Productivity and Efficiency program review metrics are Five Year Degree and/or Certificate Awards Trend, Student Credit Hours per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty, and Full-Time Equivalent Student per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty. (3000 characters or less)

There is an error in the AY18 & 19 "Five Year Degree and/or Certificate Awards Trend." AY18 is listed as 7 but there were 7 other graduates that year under the old degree title (Bachelor of Science in Technology). There were 4 additional graduates in the BST in AY19. Between AY01 and AY19, the BST averaged 12.7 graduates per year. Between AY18 and AY22, the BSATL has averaged 21 graduates per year. It appears that the work the full-time faculty member did to transition the program to the BSATL was generally productive.

The SCH/FTEP and FTES/FTEF have been decreasing over the period under review. They have been in largely steady decline since their peak in AY15. As AY14 was the high mark for the number of declared majors, there is a strong connection between recruitment and SCH/FTEF and FTES/FTEF. Productivity and efficiency remain areas for improvement. The program must focus on recruitment and increasing enrollment in the TECH offerings.

Optional: Discuss the extent to which, if any, extramural funding supports students, equipment, and faculty in the program. (2500 characters or less)

Not Applicable

7. Assess program distinctiveness, as well as any duplication resulting from the existence of a similar program or programs elsewhere in the University of Alaska System. Is duplication justified, and, if so, why? How are you coordinating with UAA's community campuses and the other universities in the system? (2000 characters or less)

The BSATL has a long history at UAA and has endured because of its accessibility, flexibility, and applicability to the needs of students and demands in the workforce. There are limited degree-completion options within the UA System, and this one is distinct in approach and content to those other options, such as the BAM at UAF. The UAF BAM program opened in AY19 and there has been a small decline in the number of BSATL majors since that time, while the number of declared majors in the BAM program has grown steadily (78 in Fall 21) while their graduation numbers have remained low, averaging 9 awards per year over its five-year existence. However, there was a larger dip in majors between AY17 (80) to AY18 (65), whereas AY19 (52).

8. Assess the strengths of your program and propose one or two action steps to address areas that need improvement. (3500 characters or less)

The strengths of this program are its accessibility, flexibility, and applicability as described above. The program needs to be strengthened through dedicated faculty assigned to both maintain its

strengths and enhance them. Adding additional required and elective TECH courses will increase the program's productivity and allow for better achievement and documentation of its PSLOs.

While this program has been able to maintain its numbers of majors over the course of the pandemic and post-pandemic enrollment drops, it has served a greater number of students in the past with even one full-time faculty member dedicated to it. The program has seen a decline in SCH production since the retirement of that faculty member and the shift of advising duties to staff.

While Chancellor Sandeen noted, "The addition two years ago, of support from a Student Success Advisor, helps the program faculty to ensure its students stay on track for graduation. These efforts appear to be working: the program graduated 25 students in 2019, well above its 7-year average of 18" (AY20 EPR). This is erroneous because the graduation data excludes awards in AY18 under the old program title: BS Technology. In addition, the faculty member who advised students remained through the end of AY19 and continued to work intensively with students. The switch to staff advising has not increased graduation rates, and SCH for TECH courses has seen a decline under this system.

Recommendation 1: Assign faculty to this program permanently or for multiple years at least and return program advising to faculty workloads.

Recommendation 2: Establish website and printed recruiting materials for this program, and use these resources to raise awareness of this program among UAA advisors and community stakeholders.

Recommendation 3: Revise program to increase the number of required TECH core courses and to provide TECH selectives for each category of requirements in the catalog copy.

After completing the Program Section above, the program review committee chair should enter their name, date, and email this form to the dean, copying the committee members. If the program is fully delivered on a community campus, copy the appropriate community campus director(s).

Committee chair first name last name: Kelly Smith

Date: 3/14/2023

END OF PROGRAM SECTION

DEAN SECTION (Due on April 1)

If the program is fully delivered on one or more community campus, the dean should consult with the director(s) of the campus. After completing the Dean Section below and entering their name, the dean should email this form to the committee, and to uaa.oaa@alaska.edu. If the program is delivered on a community campus, copy the appropriate community campus director(s). The program has one week to provide an optional response to the Dean Section using the Program Optional Response Section of this form.

1. Evaluation of Progress on Previous Recommendations

For each recommendation from the last program review, indicate if the recommendation has been met or has not been met and provide commendations and guidance as appropriate. (2000 characters or less for each recommendation)

Recommendation 1: Continue self-evaluation and make curricular revisions as recommended by the ongoing faculty committee. Recommendation has not been met.

The recommendation was not met. During the 2020 and 2021 academic years CTC focused on coordinating the other programs through the pandemic, while this program, which was already online, was left to operate as it had been. This led to a delay in assigning faculty load from other programs to examine the program. There are now assigned faculty to examine the curriculum of the BSATL, but they are just now getting to examine the program. The faculty currently assigned partial assignments will work from now until a permanent faculty member is assigned.

Recommendation 2: Continue to seek teaching faculty and "champions" from across CTC departments. Recommendation has not been met.

This recommendation has not been met yet. As indicated, there was a lack of faculty that were assigned to the program. The Applied Technology Leadership relied on adjunct faculty and staff to do what was accomplished. While the staff that was coordinating students through the program did an excellent job, a lack of faculty directly assigned to the program limited the ability to coordinate with other units within the CTC. Recently, the CTC Dean drew in some faculty, but it was too late to meet the recommendation.

Recommendation 3: Work with admissions, marketing, and advising staff from across the university to recruit additional students. Recommendation has been met.

This has been a universal issue with CTC. However, I disagree with the faculty on this recommendation, and find it at least partially successful. While CTC was able to have their programs moving forward and in person during the pandemic, all of the programs showed a decline in enrollments. The technical programs lost the least, but still were affected. The BSATL enrollment levels however, remained level. This was a solid achievement.

We started discussing the program with the rest of the University on the Deans' level in late 2020. This helped inform the rest of the colleges of this opportunity, and it was well received. Currently CTC now has a staff position that is partially assigned to marketing and the BSATL will be one of our initiatives.

Provide your analysis of #2-8 below, based on the data provided and the program's responses above.

2. Centrality of the Program. (1750 characters or less)

I agree with the faculty, the program has a wide reach for students with some college credits. The program's unique design allows us to take in almost any student and work with them to complete their degree quickly and efficiently. Additionally, the program is different and focused on a majority of the Alaskan workers, as opposed to the other unique completer business degree at UAF.

3. Program Quality and Improvement (1750 characters or less)

The faculty currently assigned to the program are working on revising the curriculum and also the assessment plan. The lack of a consistent faculty member in the program has led to this being behind. However, the current faculty committee is energetic and are willing to get the program and the assessment plans in line.

4. Student Success and the Closing of Equity Gaps (1750 characters or less)

As the faculty has pointed out, the committee did not have any previous data available for the review timeframe. The semesters to completion will be a critical dataset as the degree is designed for student completion using previous college credits, which was not included with the dataset. In the future the faculty will have a baseline for program assessment.

I do agree with the faculty though, specifically on the number of faculty that are in CTC with this degree. The BSATL provided a pathway from many people with technical training and some college to reach a Bachelor's degree and move forward in their chosen field. In this case, three of the faculty used the BSATL to begin careers in education with UAA.

5. Demand (1750 characters or less)

The demand for the Applied Technology Leadership program is rather unique. Overall, out of program credits has been low, though the TECH 412 is a draw for upper division electives. The graduation rate has remained steady, but the number of students has declined. Students are staying till completion but there are less students coming in. This could be addressed with proper advertising of the program and how we market it.

6. Productivity and Efficiency (1750 characters or less)

I agree with the faculty. CTC needs to continue to press the program marketing, which should be statewide. The BSATL is different than the business degree at UAF and would be useful for many students in the state that went into a career but now have hit a ceiling within the company or organization. CTC needs to expand the knowledge of the program and what it has to offer.

7. Duplication and Distinctiveness (1750 characters or less)

Again, I agree with the faculty. There is a difference in student enrollments in the program due to the minor overlap with UAF's program. However, the BSATL is different and should be considered distinct in the UA system.

8. Strengths and Ideas for Moving Forward (1750 characters or less)

The program's concept and need in the state are its greatest strengths. As the faculty pointed out though, the lack of consistent faculty to adjust the program has delayed key changes. CTC also needs to expand knowledge of the program through the university system and the general public.

6/27/2022

Dean's Final Evaluation

I commend the program for: (number and list the specific commendations in the narrative box, 1500 character limit)

I commend the program for not only the concepts of the program but also the consistent graduation numbers even given the unique issues of the pandemic.

I also commend the current faculty committee that stepped up to exam this program and its needs. This was a difficult task and was well done. The committee communicated with the Dean as they worked through the limited data available.

I recommend that the program: (number and list the specific recommendations in the narrative box, 1500 character limit)

I agree with the faculty's first 2 recommendations. However, I do not agree with adding more TECH courses. As such my three recommendations are as follows.

Recommendation 1: Assign faculty to this program permanently or for multiple years at least and return program advising to faculty workloads.

Recommendation 2: Establish website and printed recruiting materials for this program, and use these resources to raise awareness of this program among UAA advisors and community stakeholders.

Recommendation 3: Evaluate the program thoroughly in the aspects of course requirements, assessment plans and execution, and student pathways while keeping maximum flexibility.

Dean's overall recommendation to the provost: Enhancement -- Program will be enhanced with additional resources.

If an Interim Progress Report is proposed, recommended year: N/A

If a Follow-up Program Review is proposed, recommended year: N/A

Proposed next regular Program Review: AY2027

After completing the Dean Section above, the dean should enter their name, date, and email this form to the committee, and to uaa.oaa@alaska.edu. If the program is fully delivered on a community campus, copy the appropriate community campus director(s). The program has one week to provide an optional response to the Dean Section using the Program Optional Response Section below.

Dean first name last name: Raymond Weber

Date: 3/31/2023

END OF DEAN SECTION

6/27/2022

PROGRAM OPTIONAL RESPONSE SECTION (Due within one week of receiving dean’s review)

Programs have the option to submit to the provost a response to the dean’s evaluation within one week of receiving the dean’s review, using the narrative box below. Please indicate whether or not you will submit an optional response below.

Are you submitting an optional response? If yes, add your response below, enter your name and date, and follow the guidance below for submission. If no, enter your name and date, and follow the guidance below for submission. **Yes**

Optional Response: (10,000 characters or less)

The committee appreciates the commitment and support shown by Dean Weber for this program, our students, and the faculty currently working in the program. This review process has been successful in pointing out strengths and weaknesses in the program, as well as the need for this program to aid a diverse student population from across a largely blue-collar workforce in their efforts to improve their abilities to be competitive as opportunities present themselves to advance in their fields. The committee concurs with Dean Weber’s recommendations. Following his third recommendation to thoroughly evaluate all aspects of the program will help determine whether additional TECH courses should be developed and integrated into the program among other aspects of the program. Committee members look forward to continuing to work with Dean Weber as we operationalize the findings of the review.

After completing this section, the form should be submitted to uaa.oaa@alaska.edu, with a copy to the dean. If the program is fully delivered on a community campus, copy the appropriate community campus director(s) as well.

Committee chair first name last name: Kelly Smith

Date: 4/6/2023

END OF PROGRAM OPTIONAL RESPONSE SECTION

PROVOST SECTION (Due on August 1)

After completing, signing, and dating the Provost Section of this form, email the completed form to the program review committee and dean, with a copy to uaa.oaa@alaska.edu for posting. If the program is delivered on a community campus, copy the appropriate community campus director(s) as well.

Provost’s commendations, additional or adjusted recommendations, if any, and other general comments (3000 characters or less):

My response to the review differs somewhat from the dean’s. I commend the program for creating the permanent course for training and development. This was an important step toward serving the students of this important completion program. While I appreciate their perspective, I disagree with the faculty and the dean that the faculty should serve as the advisors for the program. There is a prevalence of inquiries for information that come during times when faculty are unavailable, such as over the

6/27/2022

summer and during breaks, so it does not make sense for faculty to serve as primary advisors. I do recommend that the faculty create a small number of additional courses, such that there could be a full-time faculty workload for the program. Where possible, the program should continue to address the past recommendations that remain unmet.

As I did last year in the Program Review process, I am asking programs to think about how they put students first. This includes continuing to monitor any courses with high DFW rates and seeking out strategies for remediation as needed. It also includes continuing to think about what it means to embrace diversity and inclusivity on the course and program level and to demonstrate this in your particular program(s). This could be through the use of proven, high-impact practices at the program level, or through proven pedagogic strategies such as designing assignments using Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT). It can also be through implementing OER and ZTC materials, particularly where course materials can be more reflective of diverse perspectives, or by using the same materials across all sections of a course. Finally, I am asking that every program identify at least one opportunity for students to develop each of UAA's core competency within the program's curricular and/or co-curricular offerings.

I am changing the decision to continued review, with a follow up review in AY25 .

Provost's decision: Continued Review -- Program is required to address specific issues and to undergo another review within the next two academic years.

Interim Progress Report year: N/A

Follow-up Program Review year: AY2025

Next regular Program Review: N/A

Provost's signature:



Date: 5/12/2023